

REMARKS

The Applicant would hereby submit remarks on the Examiner's comments in the last Office Action, comparing the invention of the rejected claims with the references cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejected the claims 3, 6 to 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)/103(a) as being unpatentable over Poynor in view of Kobayashi ('998) Motomiya and Zebelean. However, the priority date of the present application is March 5, 2001, which is earlier than the filing date of Paynor. Applicant would hereby submit an English translation of the priority document (Japanese patent application No. 2001-60777), so that the Examiner can review the same to remove Poynor as a reference.

In the meantime, it is respectfully called to the attention of the Examiner that the peen treatment disclosed by Poynor is unable to be used to machine a material, unlike the blasting process.

The Examiner also rejected claims 3, 6 to 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vista in view of Kobayashi ('998), Motomiya, Zebelean, Peterson and Taiwan Patent Nos. 055904 and 391359. Applicant, however, disagrees with the Examiner concerning this point.

Viste discloses the forming of grooves on an inside surface of a face, but it is strongly believed that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it difficult to form the grooves on an inside surface of the face by the blasting process. In the past, the blasting process has been recognized in the industry only as a process for forming markings and fine irregularities, or for performing washing or cleaning. According to conventional knowledge of the blasting process, the amount to be able to be processed per unit time is extremely small, and thus the resulting extended process time would have caused one of ordinary skill not to use the blasting process for the practical use, even though the grooves are assumed to be able to be formed by the blasting process.

As discussed above, it is strongly believed that it would not have been obvious even to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the blasting process for forming grooves. The artisan would have employed a machining process or press working, instead of employing the blasting process that requires not only a long

process time to form grooves, but also the resulting expensive cost incurred thereby.

Thus, it is strongly believed that the present invention as set forth in the claims 3, and 6-8 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of Viste even in combination of the other cited references. Specifically, employing the blast grinding for the adjustment of the thickness of metallic shells would not have been obvious to the one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was filed.

CONCLUSION

After the reply and amendment, reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested. Claims 3, 6, 7 and 8 are still pending and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Michael J. McGovern
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5000
Attorney of Record